

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 15 to 36 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 15 and 22 to 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15 and 22 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Japanese Publication No. 11-292616 (“Ayako”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,054,220 (“Mroz”). Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ayako and Mroz does not render unpatentable claims 15 and 22 to 28 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 15 is directed to a glass-ceramic composite material comprising a glass-type matrix and a ceramic filler having an oxygen content of 0.5 wt. % o 2.0 wt. %. The Final Office Action states in paragraph 7 that Ayako “is silent to the particular oxygen content of the filler” and that the disclosure of 2-4% oxygen content in Mroz renders obvious this feature of the present application. However, there exists no motivation to combine Ayako with the cited portion of Mroz and indeed Mroz teaches away from Ayako. The cited portion of Mroz describes silica coated AlN powders as insufficient for the rigors of mechanical processing. Silica coated AlN powders, as described, break down during processing, since these powders do not exhibit satisfactory damage tolerance. Further, Mroz describes problems with hydrolysis stability, leading to weight gain. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Ayako with the flawed disclosure of Mroz, and indeed would avoid the disclosure of Mroz.

Further still, the oxygen content range of the cited portion of Mroz is not the same range featured in the present application. The oxygen content range described in Mroz is greater than the oxygen content by at least two times. It is a feature of the present application that the oxygen content be very low because, as described on page 3, lines 11 to 17 of the Specification, lower oxygen content leads to an increased heat conductivity. Thus an oxygen content range at least twice as high would not feature the same benefits as the present application.

The combination of Ayako and Mroz does not disclose, or even suggest, a glass-ceramic composite material comprising a glass-type matrix and a ceramic filler having

an oxygen content of 0.5 wt. % o 2.0 wt. %. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Ayako and Mroz does not render unpatentable claim 15.

Claims 22 to 28 depend from claim 15 and therefore include all of the features of claim 15. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Ayako and Mroz does not render unpatentable claims 22 to 28, which depend from claim 15.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 29 to 36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 29 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 4,821,142 (“Ushifusa”) and Mroz. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ushifusa and Mroz does not render unpatentable claims 29 to 36 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 29 relates to a ceramic foil, ceramic laminate or microhybrid, comprising a glass-ceramic composite material comprising a glass-type matrix and a ceramic filler with an oxygen content of 0.5 wt. % o 2.0 wt. %. Similarly as with respect to claim 15, the Final Office Action states that Ushifusa is silent to the particular oxygen content of the filler and that the disclosure of 2-4% oxygen content in Mroz renders obvious this feature. For at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 15, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Ushifusa with the disclosure of Mroz.

The combination of Ushifusa and Mroz does not disclose, or even suggest, a ceramic foil, ceramic laminate or microhybrid, comprising a glass-ceramic composite material comprising a glass-type matrix and a ceramic filler having an oxygen content of 0.5 wt. % o 2.0 wt. %. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Ushifusa and Mroz does not render unpatentable claim 29.

Claim 30 relates to a mixing of a ceramic filler having an oxygen content of 0.5 wt. % to 2.0 wt. % in with the glass powder. For at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 15, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Ushifusa with the disclosure of Mroz.

The combination of Ushifusa and Mroz does not disclose, or even suggest, a mixing of a ceramic filler having an oxygen content of 0.5 wt. % to 2.0 wt. % in with the glass powder. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Ushifusa and Mroz does not render unpatentable claim 30.

Claims 31 to 36 depend from claim 30 and therefore include all of the features of claim 30. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Ushifusa and Mroz does not render unpatentable claims 31 to 36.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 16 to 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Ayako, Mroz, and U.S. Patent No. 6,514,890 (“Nagata”). Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ayako, Mroz and Nagata does not render unpatentable claims 16 to 21 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 16 to 21 depend from claim 15 and therefore include all of the features of claim 15. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Ayako and Mroz does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of claim 15 of a ceramic filler having an oxygen content of 0.5 wt. % to 2.0- wt. %. Nagata fails to cure this deficiency. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Ayako, Mroz and Nagata does not render unpatentable claims 16 to 21.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 21, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/ Reg. No. 42,194 for:
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
(212) 425-5288
CUSTOMER NO. 26646